arXiv:1408.3671v4 [math.CO] 21 Sep 2014

# ASYMPTOTIC IMPROVEMENT OF THE SUNFLOWER BOUND

JUNICHIRO FUKUYAMA

ABSTRACT. A *sunflower with a core* $Y$ is a family $\mathcal{B}$ of sets such that $U \cap U' = Y$ for each two different elements $U$ and $U'$ in $\mathcal{B}$. The well-known sunflower lemma states that a given family $\mathcal{F}$ of sets, each of cardinality at most $s$, includes a sunflower of cardinality $k$ if $|\mathcal{F}| > (k-1)^s s!$. Since Erdös and Rado proved it in 1960, it has not been known for more than half a century whether the sunflower bound $(k-1)^s s!$ can be improved asymptotically for any $k$ and $s$. It is conjectured that it can be reduced to $c_k^s$ for some real number $c_k > 0$ depending only on $k$, which is called the *sunflower conjecture*. This paper shows that the general sunflower bound can be indeed reduced by an exponential factor: We prove that $\mathcal{F}$ includes a sunflower of cardinality $k$ if

$$|\mathcal{F}| \geq \left(\sqrt{10}-2\right)^2 \left[k \cdot \min\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{10}-2}, \frac{c}{\log \min(k,s)}\right)\right]^s s!,$$

for a constant $c > 0$, and any $k \geq 2$ and $s \geq 2$. For instance, whenever $k \geq s^\epsilon$ for a given constant $\epsilon \in (0,1)$, the sunflower bound is reduced from $(k-1)^s s!$ to $(k-1)^s s! \cdot \left[O\left(\frac{1}{\log s}\right)\right]^s$, achieving the reduction ratio of $\left[O\left(\frac{1}{\log s}\right)\right]^s$. Also any $\mathcal{F}$ of cardinality at least $\left(\sqrt{10}-2\right)^2 \left(\frac{k}{\sqrt{10}-2}\right)^s s!$ includes a sunflower of cardinality $k$, where $\frac{1}{\sqrt{10}-2} = 0.8603796\ldots$. Our result demonstrates that the sunflower bound can be improved by a factor of less than a small constant to the power $s$, giving hope for further update.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

A set means a subset of a given universal set $X$. Denote by $\mathcal{F}$ a family of sets, and by $\mathcal{B}$ its sub-family. For a set $Y \subset X$, a *sunflower with a core* $Y$ is a family $\mathcal{B}$ of sets such that $U \cap U' = Y$ for each two different elements $U$ and $U'$ in $\mathcal{B}$. Equivalently, $\mathcal{B}$ is a sunflower if $U \cap U' = \bigcap_{V \in \mathcal{B}} V$ for any $U, U' \in \mathcal{B}$ such that $U \neq U'$. A sunflower of cardinality $k$ is called *$k$-sunflower* for short. A *constant* is a fixed positive real number depending on no variable.

The sunflower lemma shown by Erdös and Rado [5] states that:

**Lemma 1.1.** *A family $\mathcal{F}$ of sets, each of cardinality at most $s$, includes a $k$-sunflower if $|\mathcal{F}| > (k-1)^s s!$.*

Since its proof was given in 1960, it has not been known whether the sunflower bound $(k-1)^s s!$ can be asymptotically improved for any $k$ and $s$, despite its usefulness in combinatorics and various applications [6, 7]. It is conjectured that the bound can be reduced to $c_k^s$ for a real number $c_k > 0$ only depending on $k$, which is called *the sunflower conjecture*. The results known so far related to this topic include:

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 05D05:Extremal Set Theory (Primary).
*Key words and phrases.* Sunflower Lemma, Sunflower Conjecture, $\Delta$-System.

- Kostochka [8] showed that the sunflower bound for $k = 3$ is reduced from $2^s s!$ to $cs! \left(\frac{\log\log\log s}{\log\log s}\right)^s$ for a constant $c$. The case $k = 3$ of the sunflower conjecture is especially emphasized by Erdös [4], which other researchers also believe includes some critical difficulty.
- It has also been shown [9] that $\mathcal{F}$ of cardinality greater than $k^s \left(1 + c_s k^{-2^{-s}}\right)$ includes a $k$-sunflower for some $c_s \in \mathbb{R}^+$ depending only on $s$.
- With the sunflower bound $(k-1)^s s!$, Razborov proved an exponential lower bound on the monotone circuit complexity of the clique problem [10]. Alon and Boppana strengthened the bound [1] by relaxing the condition to be a sunflower from $U \cap U' = \bigcap_{V \in \mathcal{B}} V$ to $U \cap U' \supset \bigcap_{V \in \mathcal{B}} V$ for all $U, U' \in \mathcal{F}, U \neq U'$.
- [2] discusses the sunflower conjecture and its variants in relation to fast matrix multiplication algorithms. Especially, it is shown in the paper that if the sunflower conjecture is true, the Coppersmith-Winograd conjecture implying a faster matrix multiplication algorithm [3] does not hold.

In this paper we show that the general sunflower bound can be indeed improved by an exponential factor. We prove the following theorem.

**Theorem 1.2.** *A family $\mathcal{F}$ of sets, each of cardinality at most $s$, includes a $k$-sunflower if*

$$|\mathcal{F}| \geq \left(\sqrt{10} - 2\right)^2 \left[k \cdot \min\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{10} - 2}, \frac{c}{\log\min(k, s)}\right)\right]^s s!,$$

*for a constant $c$ and any integers $k \geq 2$ and $s \geq 2$.*

This improves the sunflower bound by the factor of $\left[O\left(\frac{1}{\log s}\right)\right]^s$ whenever $k$ exceeds $s^\epsilon$ for a given constant $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$. Also any $\mathcal{F}$ of cardinality at least $\left(\sqrt{10} - 2\right)^2 \left(\frac{k}{\sqrt{10}-2}\right)^s s!$ includes a $k$-sunflower.

We split its proof in two steps. We will show:

**Statement I:** $\mathcal{F}$ includes a $k$-sunflower if $|\mathcal{F}| \geq \left(\sqrt{10} - 2\right)^2 \left(\frac{k}{\sqrt{10}-2}\right)^s s!$ for any positive integers $s$ and $k$.

**Statement II:** $\mathcal{F}$ includes a $k$-sunflower if $|\mathcal{F}| \geq \left[\frac{ck}{\log\min(s,k)}\right]^s s!$ for some constant $c$ and any integers $s \geq 2$ and $k \geq 2$.

It is clear that the two statements mean Theorem 1.2. The rest of the paper is dedicated to the description of their proofs.

## 2. Terminology and Related Facts

Denote an arbitrary set by $S$ that is a subset of $X$. Given a family $\mathcal{F}$ of sets of cardinality at most $s$, define

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{F}(S) \stackrel{def}{=} \{U \ : \ U \in \mathcal{F} \text{ and } U \cap S \neq \emptyset\}, \\
&\mathcal{F}_j(S) \stackrel{def}{=} \{U \ : \ U \in \mathcal{F} \text{ and } |U \cap S| = j\} \text{ for positive integer } j, \\
&\mathcal{F}_{sup}(S) \stackrel{def}{=} \{U \ : \ U \in \mathcal{F} \text{ and } U \supset S\}, \text{ and} \\
&\mathcal{P}(S) \stackrel{def}{=} \{(v, U) \ : \ v \in X, \ U \in \mathcal{F} \text{ and } v \in U \cap S\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Let $\epsilon \in (0, 1/8)$ be a constant and $k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. Given such numbers, we use the following two functions as lower bounds on $|\mathcal{F}|$:

$$\Phi_1(s) \stackrel{def}{=} \left(\sqrt{10}-2\right)^2 \left(\frac{k}{\sqrt{10}-2}\right)^s s!, \text{ and}$$

$$\Phi_2(s) \stackrel{def}{=} \frac{k^s s!}{p_1 p_2 \cdots p_s}, \text{ where } p_j \stackrel{def}{=} \begin{cases} \epsilon \ln \min(j,k) & \text{if } j \geq 2, \\ \epsilon & \text{if } j = 1. \end{cases}$$

Here $\ln \cdot$ denotes the natural logarithm of a positive real number. We regard $\Phi_i(j) = 0$ if $j \notin \mathbb{Z}^+$ for each $i = 1, 2$.

The following lemma shows that Statement II is proved if $|\mathcal{F}| \geq \Phi_2(s)$ means a $k$-sunflower in $\mathcal{F}$.

**Lemma 2.1.** *There exists a constant $c$ such that $\Phi_2(s) \leq \left(\frac{ck}{\ln \min(k,s)}\right)^s s!$ for any $s \geq 2$ and $k \geq 2$.*

It is shown by $p_1 p_2 \cdots p_s \geq (c' \ln \min(k,s))^s$ for another constant $c'$. Its exact proof is found in Appendix.

We also have

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_2(s) &= \frac{ks}{p_s}\Phi_2(s-1) = \frac{ks \cdot k(s-1)}{p_s p_{s-1}}\Phi_2(s-2) = \cdots \\ &= \frac{k^j s(s-1)\cdots(s-j+1)}{p_s p_{s-1} \cdots p_{s-j+1}}\Phi_2(s-j) \\ &= \frac{k^j}{p_s p_{s-1} \cdots p_{s-j+1}} \cdot \frac{s!}{(s-j)!}\Phi_2(s-j) \\ &\geq \left(\frac{k}{p_s}\right)^j \frac{s!}{(s-j)!}\Phi_2(s-j), \end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

for each positive integer $j < s$. The last inequality is due to $p_2 \leq p_3 \leq \cdots \leq p_s$.

To derive another inequality from (2.1), we use Stirling's approximation $\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{n!}{\sqrt{2\pi n}\left(\frac{n}{e}\right)^n} = 1$ where $e = 2.71828...$ denotes the natural logarithm base. In a form of double inequality, it is known as

$$\sqrt{2\pi n} \cdot n^n e^{-n+\frac{1}{12n+1}} < n! < \sqrt{2\pi n} \cdot n^n e^{-n+\frac{1}{12n}},$$

for $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ [11]. This means

$$\sqrt{2\pi n} \cdot n^n e^{-n} < n! \leq \sqrt{n} \cdot n^n e^{-n+1}. \tag{2.2}$$

Thus,

$$\binom{n}{m} < \frac{n^m}{m!} < \exp\left(m \ln \frac{n}{m} + m - \ln \sqrt{2\pi m}\right) < \exp\left(m \ln \frac{n}{m} + m\right), \tag{2.3}$$

for positive integers $n$ and $m$ such that $n \geq m$. We substitute $s! > \sqrt{2\pi s} \cdot s^s e^{-s}$ and $(s-j)! \leq \sqrt{s-j} \cdot (s-j)^{s-j} e^{-s+j+1}$ from (2.2) into (2.1) to see:

**Lemma 2.2.** $\Phi_2(s) > \Phi_2(s-j) \exp\left(j \ln \frac{ks}{p_s} - \frac{j^2}{s} - 1\right)$ *for a positive integer $j < s$.*

A precise proof is also given in Appendix.

## 3. The Improvement Method

We will show Statements I and II by improving the original proof of the sunflower lemma in [5]. We review it in a way to introduce our proof method easily. The original proof shows by induction on $s$ that $\mathcal{F}$ includes a $k$-sunflower if $|\mathcal{F}| > \Phi_0(s)$, where

$$\Phi_0(s) \stackrel{def}{=} (k-1)^s s!.$$

The claim is clearly true in the induction basis $s = 1$; the family $\mathcal{F}$ consists of more than $k-1$ different sets of cardinality at most 1 including a desired sunflower.

To show the induction step, let

$$\mathcal{B} = \{B_1, B_2, \ldots, B_r\}$$

be a sub-family of $\mathcal{F}$ consisting of pairwise disjoint sets $B_i$, whose cardinality $r$ is maximum. We say that such $\mathcal{B}$ is a *maximal coreless sunflower in* $\mathcal{F}$ for notational convenience in this paper. Also write

$$B \stackrel{def}{=} B_1 \cup B_2 \cup \cdots \cup B_r.$$

We show $r \geq k$ to complete the induction step. We have

$$|\mathcal{F}_{sup}(S)| \leq \Phi_0(s - |S|) \text{ for any } S \subset X \text{ such that } 1 \leq |S| < s, \tag{3.1}$$

for $\mathcal{F}_{sup}(S)$, the sub-family of $\mathcal{F}$ consisting of the sets including $S$ as defined in Section 2. Otherwise a $k$-sunflower exists in $\mathcal{F}$ by induction hypothesis. Then the sub-family $\mathcal{F}(B)$ consisting of the sets intersecting with $B$ meets $|\mathcal{F}(B)| \leq |B|\Phi_0(s-1)$; because for every element $v$ in $B$, the cardinality of $\mathcal{F}(\{v\}) = \mathcal{F}_{sup}(\{v\})$ is bounded by $\Phi_0(s-1)$. Also $\Phi_0(s-1) = \frac{\Phi_0(s)}{ks}$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{F}(B)| &\leq |B|\Phi_0(s-1) \leq rs\Phi_0(s-1) \\ &= rs\frac{\Phi_0(s)}{ks} = \frac{r}{k}\Phi_0(s) < \frac{r}{k}|\mathcal{F}|. \end{aligned} \tag{3.2}$$

Now $|\mathcal{F}(B)|$ is less than $|\mathcal{F}|$ unless $r \geq k$. In other words, if $r < k$, then $\mathcal{F}$ would have a set disjoint with any $B_i \in \mathcal{B}$, contradicting the maximality of $r = |\mathcal{B}|$. Hence $r \geq k$, meaning $\mathcal{B}$ includes a $k$-sunflower with an empty core. This proves the induction step.

To improve this argument, we note that the proof works even if $\mathcal{F}_{sup}(\{v\})$ for all $v \in B$ are disjoint. If so, each $\mathcal{F}_{sup}(\{v\})$ includes elements $U \in \mathcal{F}$ only intersecting with $\{v\}$, and disjoint with $B - \{v\}$. Let $v \in B_i \in \mathcal{B}$. If we replace $B_i$ by any set $U$ in $\mathcal{F}_{sup}(\{v\})$ such that $U \cap (B - \{v\}) = \emptyset$, then $\mathcal{B}$ is still a maximal coreless sunflower in $\mathcal{F}$.

On the other hand, if there are sufficiently many $U \in \mathcal{F}_{sup}(\{v\})$ disjoint with $B - \{v\}$, we can find $U$ among them such that $|U \cap B_i|$ is much smaller than $s$. (Here we assume both $k$ are $s$ are are large enough.) This gives us the following contradiction: Due to the maximality of $r = |\mathcal{B}|$, the family $\mathcal{F}(U)$ must contain $\mathcal{F}(B_i) - \mathcal{F}(B - B_i)$. So $\mathcal{F}(U) \cap \mathcal{F}(B_i)$ includes most sets in $\mathcal{F}_{sup}(\{v\})$ being a not

too small family. But by (3.1), $|\mathcal{F}(U) \cap \mathcal{F}(B_i)|$ is upper-bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} & s^2\Phi_0(s-2) + |U \cap B_i|\Phi_0(s-1) \\ = \quad & s^2 \cdot \frac{\Phi_0(s)}{k^2 s(s-1)} + |U \cap B_i| \cdot \frac{\Phi_0(s)}{ks} \\ < \quad & |\mathcal{F}| \left( \frac{1}{k^2\left(1-\frac{1}{s}\right)} + \frac{|U \cap B_i|}{ks} \right). \end{aligned}$$

As $|U \cap B_i|$ is much smaller than $s$, the cardinality $|\mathcal{F}(U) \cap \mathcal{F}(B_i)|$ is also small, *i.e.* bounded by $|\mathcal{F}|$ times $O\left(\frac{1}{k^2} + \frac{|U \cap B_i|}{ks}\right)$. This contradiction on $|\mathcal{F}(U) \cap \mathcal{F}(B_i)|$ essentially means that if $r$ is around $k$, we can construct a larger coreless sunflower in $\mathcal{F}$. Hence $r$ must be more than $k$ with the cardinality lower bound $\Phi_0(s)$.

Our proof of Theorem 1.2 in the next section generalizes the above observation. By finding $B_i \in \mathcal{B}$ with sufficiently large $|\mathcal{F}(B_i) - \mathcal{B}(B - B_i)|$, we will show Statement I that $\mathcal{F}$ such that $|\mathcal{F}| \geq \left(\sqrt{10}-2\right)^2 \left(\frac{k}{\sqrt{10}-2}\right)^2 s!$ includes a $k$-sunflower.

We will further extend this argument to show Statement II. Instead of finding just one such $B_i \in \mathcal{B}$, we will find $\mathcal{B}' \subset \mathcal{B}$ such that a sub-family $\mathcal{H}$ of

$$\mathcal{F}\left(\bigcup_{S \in \mathcal{B}'} S\right) - \mathcal{F}\left(\bigcup_{S' \in \mathcal{B} - \mathcal{B}'} S'\right) \tag{3.3}$$

is sufficiently large. Then we show a maximal coreless sunflower in $\mathcal{H}$ whose cardinality is larger than $|\mathcal{B}'|$. This again contradicts the maximality of $r = |\mathcal{B}|$ to prove the second statement.

## 4. Proof of Theorem 1.2

4.1. **Statement I.** We prove Statement I in this section. Put

$$\delta = \sqrt{10} - 3 = 0.16227\ldots, \text{ and } x = \frac{k}{1+\delta} = \frac{k}{\sqrt{10}-2},$$

then

$$\Phi_1(s) = \left(\sqrt{10}-2\right)^2 \left(\frac{k}{\sqrt{10}-2}\right)^s s! = (1+\delta)^2 x^s s!,$$

as defined in Section 2. We show that $|\mathcal{F}| \geq \Phi_1(s)$ means a $(1+\delta)\,x$-sunflower included in $\mathcal{F}$.

We prove it by induction on $s$. Its basis occurs when $s \leq 2$. The claim is true by the sunflower lemma, since $\Phi_1(s) = (1+\delta)^2 x^s s! \geq ((1+\delta)x)^s\, s! = k^s s! > (k-1)^2 s!$ if $s \leq 2$. Assume true for $1, 2, \ldots, s-1$ and prove true for $s \geq 3$. As in Section 3, let $\mathcal{B} = \{B_1, B_2, \ldots, B_r\}$ be a maximal coreless sunflower of cardinality $r$ in $\mathcal{F}$, and $B = B_1 \cup B_2 \cup \cdots \cup B_r$. Contrarily to the claim, let us assume

$$r < (1+\delta)x. \tag{4.1}$$

We will find a contradiction caused by (4.1).

Observe the following facts.

- For any nonempty set $S \subset X$ such that $|S| < s$, if $|\mathcal{F}_{sup}(S)| \geq \Phi_1\left(s - |S|\right)$, the family $\mathcal{F}_{sup}(S)$ contains a $(1+\delta)x$-sunflower by induction hypothesis. Thus we assume

$$|\mathcal{F}_{sup}(S)| < \Phi_1\left(s - |S|\right) \text{ for } S \subset X \text{ such that } 1 \leq |S| < s. \tag{4.2}$$

- We also have $k \geq 3$, because $\Phi_1(s) > 0$ for $k = 1$, and $\Phi_2(s) = \left(\sqrt{10}-2\right)^2 \left(\frac{2}{\sqrt{10}-2}\right)^s s! > s! = (k-1)^s s!$ if $k = 2$.
- Since $r$ has the maximum value,

$$\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}(B), \tag{4.3}$$

  *i.e.*, every set in $\mathcal{F}$ intersects with $B$.
- $\mathcal{P}(B)$, defined in Section 2 as the family of pairs $(v, U)$ such that $U \in \mathcal{F}$ and $v \in U \cap B$, has a cardinality bounded by

$$|\mathcal{P}(B)| \leq |B|\Phi_1(s-1) \leq rs\Phi_1(s-1) < (1+\delta)xs \cdot \frac{\Phi_1(s)}{xs} \leq (1+\delta)|\mathcal{F}|, \tag{4.4}$$

  due to (4.1) and (4.2). Here $|\mathcal{P}(B)| \leq |B|\Phi_1(s-1)$ because for each $v \in B$, there are at most $\Phi_1(s-1)$ pairs $(v, U) \in \mathcal{P}(B)$.

We first see that many $U \in \mathcal{F}$ intersect with $B$ by cardinality 1, *i.e.*, $|\mathcal{F}_1(B)|$ is sufficiently large. Observe two lemmas.

**Lemma 4.1.** $|\mathcal{F}_1(B)| > (1-\delta)|\mathcal{F}|$.

*Proof.* Let $|\mathcal{F}_1(B)| = (1-\delta')|\mathcal{F}|$ for some $\delta' \in [0, 1]$. By (4.3), there are $\delta'|\mathcal{F}|$ elements $U \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $|U \cap B| \geq 2$, each of which creates two or more pairs in $\mathcal{P}(B)$. If $\delta' \geq \delta$,

$$|\mathcal{P}(B)| \geq (1-\delta')|\mathcal{F}| + 2\delta'|\mathcal{F}| = (1+\delta')|\mathcal{F}| \geq (1+\delta)|\mathcal{F}|,$$

contradicting (4.4). Thus $\delta' < \delta$ proving the lemma. □

**Lemma 4.2.** *There exists* $B_i \in \{B_1, B_2, \ldots, B_r\}$ *such that* $|\mathcal{F}_1(B_i) - \mathcal{F}(B - B_i)| \geq \frac{1-\delta}{1+\delta} \cdot \frac{\Phi_1(s)}{x}$.

*Proof.* By Lemma 4.1, there exists $B_i \in \{B_1, B_2, \ldots, B_r\}$ such that the number of $U \in \mathcal{F}$ intersecting with $B_i$ by cardinality 1, and disjoint with $B - B_i$, is at least

$$\frac{(1-\delta)|\mathcal{F}|}{r} > \frac{1-\delta}{(1+\delta)x} \cdot |\mathcal{F}| \geq \frac{1-\delta}{1+\delta} \cdot \frac{\Phi_1(s)}{x}.$$

The family of such $U$ is exactly $\mathcal{F}_1(B_i) - \mathcal{F}(B - B_i)$, so its cardinality is no less than $\frac{1-\delta}{1+\delta} \cdot \frac{\Phi_1(s)}{x}$. □

Assume such $B_i$ is $B_1$ without loss of generality. Then

$$|\mathcal{F}(B_1) - \mathcal{F}(B - B_1)| \geq |\mathcal{F}_1(B_1) - \mathcal{F}(B - B_1)| \geq \frac{1-\delta}{1+\delta} \cdot \frac{\Phi_1(s)}{x} > 0.$$

We choose any element $B_1' \in \mathcal{F}_1(B_1) - \mathcal{F}(B - B_1)$ that is not $B_1$. Switch $B_1$ with $B_1'$ in $\mathcal{B}$. Since $B_1'$ is disjoint with any of $B_2, B_3, \ldots, B_r$, the obtained family $\{B_1', B_2, \ldots, B_r\}$ is another maximal coreless sunflower in $\mathcal{F}$. We see the following inequality.

-

**Lemma 4.3.**

$$|\mathcal{F}(B_1) \cap \mathcal{F}(B_1')| < \frac{\Phi_1(s)}{x}\left(\frac{1}{s}+\frac{1}{x}\right).$$

*Proof.* A set $U \in F(B_1) \cap F(B_1')$ intersects with $B_1 \cap B_1'$ of cardinality 1, or both $B_1 - B_1'$ and $B_1' - B_1$ of cardinality $s-1$. By (4.2), there are at most

$$\begin{aligned} & \Phi_1(s-1) + (s-1)^2\Phi_1(s-2) = \frac{\Phi_1(s)}{sx} + (s-1)^2\frac{\Phi_1(s)}{s(s-1)x^2} \\ < \quad & \frac{\Phi_1(s)}{x}\left(\frac{1}{s}+\frac{1}{x}\right) \end{aligned}$$

such $U \in F(B_1) \cap F(B_1')$. The lemma follows. □

$\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}(B_1' \cup B_2 \cup B_3 \cup \cdots \cup B_r)$ would be true if the cardinality $r$ of the new coreless sunflower $\{B_1', B_2, B_3, \ldots, B_r\}$ were maximum. However, it means that every element in $\mathcal{F}(B_1) - \mathcal{F}(B - B_1)$ is included in $\mathcal{F}(B_1')$. Thus, $\mathcal{F}(B_1) \cap F(B_1') \supset \mathcal{F}(B_1) - \mathcal{F}(B - B_1)$, leading to

$$|\mathcal{F}(B_1) \cap F(B_1')| \geq |\mathcal{F}(B_1) - \mathcal{F}(B - B_1)| \geq \frac{1-\delta}{1+\delta} \cdot \frac{\Phi_1(s)}{x} \geq \frac{\Phi_1(s)}{x}\left(\frac{1}{s}+\frac{1}{x}\right).$$

Its last inequality is confirmed with $s \geq 3$, $k \geq 3$, $x = \frac{k}{1+\delta}$, and $\frac{1-\delta}{1+\delta} = \frac{1}{3} + \frac{1+\delta}{3}$ as $\delta = \sqrt{10} - 3$. This contradicts Lemma 4.3, completing the proof of Statement I.

4.2. **Statement II.** We prove the second statement by further developing the above method. We show that $\mathcal{F}$ includes a $k$-sunflower if $|\mathcal{F}| > \Phi_2(s)$ for a choice of sufficiently small constant $\epsilon \in (0, 1/8)$. This suffices to prove Statement II thanks to Lemma 2.1. The proof is by induction on $s$. Its basis occurs when $\min(k,s)$ is smaller than a sufficiently large constant $c_1$, *i.e.*, when $\min(k,s)$ is smaller than a lower bound $c_1$ on $\min(k,s)$ required by the proof below. To meet this case, we choose $\epsilon \in (0, 1/8)$ to be smaller than $1/\ln c_1$. Then $\Phi_2(s) \geq k^s s! > (k-1)^s s!$ by the definition of $\Phi_2$ in Section 2. The family $\mathcal{F}$ thus includes a $k$-sunflower by the sunflower lemma in the basis.

Assume true for $1, 2, \ldots, s-1$ and prove true for $s$. The two integers $k$ and $s$ satisfy

$$\min(k,s) \geq c_1, \tag{4.5}$$

*i.e.*, they are sufficiently large. Put

$$p \stackrel{def}{=} \frac{1}{8}\ln\min(k,s), \quad \text{and} \quad x \stackrel{def}{=} \frac{k}{p}.$$

$p$ is sufficiently large since both $k$ and $s$ are.

**Note.** The lower bound $c_1$ on $\min(s,k)$ is required in order to satisfy (4.8), (4.10), (4.11) and (4.12) below, which are inequalities with fixed coefficients and no $\epsilon$. We choose $c_1$ as the minimum positive integer such that $\min(k,s) \geq c_1$ satisfies the inequalities, and also $\epsilon$ as $\min\left(\frac{1}{2\ln c_1}, \frac{1}{9}\right)$.

As $p_s = \epsilon \ln\min(k,s) < p$ in (2.1),

$$\Phi_2(s-1) = \frac{p_s}{ks}\Phi_2(s) < \frac{p}{ks}\Phi_2(s) = \frac{\Phi_2(s)}{xs}. \tag{4.6}$$

Similarly to (4.2), we have

$$|\mathcal{F}_{sup}\left(s-|S|\right)|<\Phi_2(s-|S|) \text{ for any } S\subset X \text{ with } 1\leq |S|<s,$$

as induction hypothesis. We also keep denoting a maximal coreless sunflower in $\mathcal{F}$ by $\mathcal{B}=\{B_1,B_2,\ldots,B_r\}$, and $B_1\cup B_2\cup\cdots\cup B_r$ by $B$. Also (4.3) holds due to the maximality of $r=|\mathcal{B}|$.

We prove $r\geq k$ for the induction step. Suppose contrarily that

$$x\leq r<k, \tag{4.7}$$

and we will find a contradiction. Here $r\geq x$ is confirmed similarly to (3.2) in Section 3, *i.e.*, by

$$|\mathcal{F}(B)|\leq |B|\Phi_2(s-1)\leq rs\Phi_2(s-1)\leq rs\frac{\Phi_2(s)}{xs}\leq \frac{r}{x}|\mathcal{F}|,$$

with (4.6), so $r<x$ would contradict the maximality of $r=|\mathcal{B}|$.

We start our proof by showing a claim seen similarly to Lemma 4.1.

**Lemma 4.4.** *There exists a positive integer $j\leq 2p$ such that $|\mathcal{F}_j\left(B\right)|\geq\frac{\Phi_2(s)}{4p}$.*

*Proof.* We first show $\left|\sum_{0\leq j\leq 2p}\mathcal{F}_j\left(B\right)\right|\geq\frac{1}{2}|\mathcal{F}|$. If not, there would be at least $\frac{1}{2}|\mathcal{F}|$ sets $U\in\mathcal{F}$ such that $|U\cap B|>2p$ by the definition of $\mathcal{F}_j$ given in Section 2. Each such $U$ creates at least $\lceil 2p\rceil$ pairs $(v,U)\in\mathcal{P}\left(B\right)$, so

$$|\mathcal{P}\left(B\right)|\geq 2p\cdot\frac{|\mathcal{F}|}{2}=p|\mathcal{F}|.$$

However, similarly to (4.4),

$$|\mathcal{P}(B)|\leq |B|\Phi_2(s-1)\leq rs\Phi_2(s-1)<ks\cdot\frac{p\Phi_2(s)}{ks}\leq p|\mathcal{F}|,$$

by induction hypothesis and (4.6). By the contradictory two inequalities, $\left|\sum_{0\leq j\leq 2p}\mathcal{F}_j\left(B\right)\right|<\frac{1}{2}|\mathcal{F}|$ is false. Thus $\left|\sum_{0\leq j\leq 2p}\mathcal{F}_j\left(B\right)\right|\geq\frac{1}{2}|\mathcal{F}|$.

Let $j$ be an integer in $[1,2p]$ with the maximum cardinality of $\mathcal{F}_j\left(B\right)$. By the above claim and (4.3), $|\mathcal{F}_j\left(B\right)|\geq\frac{|\mathcal{F}|}{2}\cdot\frac{1}{2p}\geq\frac{\Phi_2(s)}{4p}$, proving the lemma. □

Fix this integer $j\in[1,2p]$. Next we find a small sub-family $\mathcal{B}'$ of $\mathcal{B}$ such that (3.3) is large enough. For each non-empty $\mathcal{B}'\subset\mathcal{B}$, define

$$\mathcal{G}\left(\mathcal{B}'\right)\stackrel{def}{=}\left\{U\ :\ U\in\mathcal{F}_j\left(B\right),\ \forall S\in\mathcal{B}',U\cap S\neq\emptyset \text{ and } \forall S'\in\mathcal{B}-\mathcal{B}',U\cap S'=\emptyset\right\}.$$

Observe a lemma regarding $\mathcal{G}\left(\mathcal{B}'\right)$.

**Lemma 4.5.** *There exists a nonempty sub-family $\mathcal{B}'\subset\mathcal{B}$ of cardinality at most $j$ such that $|\mathcal{G}\left(\mathcal{B}'\right)|\geq\frac{\Phi_2(s)}{8p\binom{r}{j}}$.*

*Proof.* By definition, the cardinality of $\mathcal{B}'$ such that $\mathcal{G}\left(\mathcal{B}'\right)\neq\emptyset$ does not exceed $j$. Thus there are at most

$$\begin{aligned}&\binom{r}{j}+\binom{r}{j-1}+\binom{r}{j-2}+\cdots+\binom{r}{1}\\ <\ &\binom{r}{j}\left(1+\frac{j}{r-j+1}+\left(\frac{j}{r-j+1}\right)^2+\left(\frac{j}{r-j+1}\right)^3+\cdots\right)\leq 2\binom{r}{j}\end{aligned}$$

such possible $\mathcal{B}'\subset\mathcal{B}$. Here its truth is confirmed by the following arguments.

- $\binom{n}{m-1} = \frac{m}{n-m+1}\binom{n}{m}$ for any $n, m \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ such that $m \le n$. So $\binom{r}{j-1} = \frac{j}{r-j+1}\binom{r}{j}$, $\binom{r}{j-2} = \frac{j-1}{r-j+2}\binom{r}{j-1} < \left(\frac{j}{r-j+1}\right)^2 \binom{r}{j}$, $\binom{r}{j-3} = \frac{j-2}{r-j+3}\binom{r}{j-2} < \left(\frac{j}{r-j+1}\right)^3 \binom{r}{j}$, $\cdots$.
- The last inequality is due to $r \ge x = \frac{k}{p} = \frac{8k}{\ln \min(k,s)} > \frac{k}{\ln k}$ by (4.7), and $j \le 2p < \ln k$. Thus

$$\frac{j}{r-j+1} < \frac{\ln k}{\frac{k}{\ln k} - \ln k + 1} < \frac{1}{2}, \tag{4.8}$$

by (4.5) where $k$ is sufficiently large. So the last inequality holds in the above.

Then by Lemma 4.4, there exists at least one nonempty $\mathcal{B}' \subset \mathcal{B}$ such that

$$|\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{B}')| > \frac{|\mathcal{F}_j(B)|}{2\binom{r}{j}} \ge \frac{\Phi_2(s)}{2\binom{r}{j} \cdot 4p} = \frac{\Phi_2(s)}{8p\binom{r}{j}}.$$

The lemma follows. □

We now construct a sub-family $\mathcal{H}$ of (3.3) in which we will find a larger maximal coreless sunflower. Fix a sub-family $\mathcal{B}' \subset \mathcal{B}$ decided by Lemma 4.5. Put

$$\begin{aligned} & B' \stackrel{def}{=} \bigcup_{S \in \mathcal{B}'} S, \\ & r' \stackrel{def}{=} |\mathcal{B}'| \le j \le 2p, \\ \text{and} \qquad & \mathcal{H} \stackrel{def}{=} F_j(B') - F(B - B') = \mathcal{F}_j\left(\bigcup_{S \in \mathcal{B}'} S\right) - \mathcal{F}\left(\bigcup_{S' \in \mathcal{B} - \mathcal{B}'} S'\right). \end{aligned}$$

The family $\mathcal{H}$ includes $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{B}')$ by definition, so

$$|\mathcal{H}| \ge \frac{\Phi_2(s)}{8p\binom{r}{j}}, \tag{4.9}$$

by Lemma 4.5. If we find a maximal coreless sunflower in $\mathcal{H}$ whose cardinality is larger than $r' = |\mathcal{B}'|$, it means the existence of a coreless sunflower in $\mathcal{F}$ with cardinality larger than $r$, since any $U \in \mathcal{H}$ is disjoint with $B - B'$.

Extending the notation $\mathcal{F}(S)$, write

$$\mathcal{H}(S) \stackrel{def}{=} \{U \ : \ U \in \mathcal{H} \text{ and } U \cap S \ne \emptyset\},$$

for a nonempty set $S \subset X$. Then $\mathcal{H}(\{v\})$ for an element $v \in X$ is the family of $U \in \mathcal{H} \subset \mathcal{F}$ containing $v$.

Let us show two lemmas on $\mathcal{H}$ and $\mathcal{H}(\{v\})$. By them we will see that the latter is sufficiently smaller than the former.

**Lemma 4.6.** $|\mathcal{H}| > s^j \Phi_2(s-j) \exp(-4p)$.

*Proof.* We have two facts on (4.9).

- The natural logarithm of the denominator $8p\binom{r}{j}$ is upper-bounded by

$$\ln 8p\binom{r}{j} < j \ln \frac{r}{j} + j + \ln 8p < j \ln \frac{k}{j} + j + \ln 8p = j \ln \frac{xp}{j} + j + \ln 8p,$$

due to (2.3), (4.7) and $x = \frac{k}{p}$.

- Let $d = \ln \Phi_2(s) - \ln \Phi_2(s-j)$, or $\Phi_2(s) = \Phi_2(s-j)\exp(d)$. It satisfies

$$d > j \ln \frac{ks}{p_s} - \frac{j^2}{s} - 1 > j \ln \frac{ks}{p} - \frac{j^2}{s} - 1 = j \ln sx - \frac{j^2}{s} - 1 > j \ln sx - j - 1,$$

by Lemma 2.2, $p_s < p$, and $j \le s$.

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{H}| &\ge \frac{\Phi_2(s)}{8p\binom{r}{j}} > \Phi_2(s-j)\exp\left((j \ln sx - j - 1) - \left(j \ln \frac{xp}{j} + j + \ln 8p\right)\right) \\ &= s^j \Phi_2(s-j)\exp\left(-j \ln \frac{p}{j} - 2j - \ln 8p - 1\right). \end{aligned}$$

Find $\max_{1 \le j \le 2p}\left(j \ln \frac{p}{j} + 2j\right)$ regarding $j$ as a real parameter. The maximum value $(4 - 2\ln 2)p$ is achieved when $j = 2p$. Since $p$ is sufficiently large by (4.5),

$$2p \ln 2 > 1 + \ln 8p. \tag{4.10}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{H}| &> s^j \exp\left(-j \ln \frac{p}{j} - 2j - \ln 8p - 1\right) \ge s^j \exp\left(-(4 - 2\ln 2)p - \ln 8p - 1\right) \\ &> s^j \Phi_2(s-j)\exp\left(-4p\right), \end{aligned}$$

completing the proof. □

**Lemma 4.7.** *The following two statements hold true.*

*i)* $|\mathcal{H}(\{v\})| \le \frac{1}{s} \cdot e^{7p} \cdot |\mathcal{H}|$ *for every* $v \in B'$.

*ii)* $|\mathcal{H}(\{v\})| \le \frac{1}{(s-j)x} \cdot e^{7p} \cdot |\mathcal{H}|$ *for every* $v \in X - B'$.

*Proof.* i): Let $U$ be any set in $\mathcal{H}(\{v\})$ for the given $v \in B'$, and write $U' = U \cap B'$. Since $U'$ has cardinality $j$ containing $v$, there are no more than

$$\binom{|B'|-1}{j-1} \le \binom{r's-1}{j-1} = \frac{j}{r's}\binom{r's}{j} \le \frac{j}{s}\binom{r's}{j}$$

choices of $U'$. Here the identity $\binom{r's}{j} = \frac{r's}{j}\binom{r's-1}{j-1}$ is used. By the induction hypothesis on $s$, the number of $U \in \mathcal{H}(\{v\})$ is upper-bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{H}(\{v\})| &\le \frac{j}{s}\binom{r's}{j} \cdot \Phi_2(s-j) \le \frac{\Phi_2(s-j)}{s}\exp\left(\ln j + \left(j \ln \frac{r's}{j} + j\right)\right) \\ &\le s^j \Phi_2(s-j)\frac{\exp\left(j \ln \frac{r'}{j} + j + \ln j\right)}{s} \le s^j \Phi_2(s-j)\frac{\exp\left(j + \ln j\right)}{s} \\ &\le s^j \Phi_2(s-j)\frac{\exp\left(2p + \ln 2p\right)}{s} < s^j \Phi_2(s-j)\frac{\exp\left(3p\right)}{s}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\binom{r's}{j} \le \exp\left(j \ln \frac{r's}{j} + j\right)$ is due to (2.3), and

$$2p + \ln 2p < 3p, \tag{4.11}$$

due to (4.5).

With the previous lemma, we see that the ratio $|\mathcal{H}(\{v\})|/|\mathcal{H}|$ does not exceed

$$\frac{s^j \Phi_2(s-j)\exp\left(3p\right)/s}{s^j \Phi_2(s-j)\exp\left(-4p\right)} = \frac{e^{7p}}{s},$$

proving i).

ii): As $v \in X - B'$, the number of choices of $U' = U \cap B'$ is now $\binom{|B'|}{j} \le \binom{r's}{j}$. For each such $U'$, the number of sets $U \in \mathcal{H}$ containing $U' \cup \{v\}$ is at most

$$\Phi_2(s-j-1) \quad = \quad \frac{p_{s-j}}{k(s-j)}\Phi_2(s-j) < \frac{p}{k(s-j)}\Phi_2(s-j) = \frac{1}{x(s-j)}\Phi_2(s-j),$$

by induction hypothesis and $p_{s-j} \le p_s < p$. Hence $|\mathcal{H}(\{v\})|$ is upper-bounded by $\frac{\Phi_2(s-j)}{(s-j)x}\binom{r's}{j}$. Then argue similarly to i). □

Lemma 4.7 means that $\mathcal{H}$ includes a coreless sunflower of cardinality more than $r' = |\mathcal{B}'|$. Let us formally prove it with the following lemma.

**Lemma 4.8.** *$|\mathcal{B}'| \cdot |\mathcal{H}(V)| \le \frac{1}{2}|\mathcal{H}|$ for every $V \in \mathcal{H}$.*

*Proof.* Let

$$y \stackrel{def}{=} \min(s,k), \text{ so that } p = \frac{1}{8}\ln y,\ y = e^{8p},\ s \ge y, \text{ and } x = \frac{k}{p} \ge \frac{y}{p}.$$

We have

$$p \ge 1 \text{ and } 8p^3e^{-p} < \frac{1}{2}, \tag{4.12}$$

due to (4.5).

Fix each $V \in \mathcal{H}$. By Lemma 4.7, the family $\mathcal{H}(V)$ has a cardinality bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}
|\mathcal{H}(V)| &= \bigcup_{v\in V} |\mathcal{H}(\{v\})| \le \left(j \cdot \frac{e^{7p}}{s} + (s-j)\frac{e^{7p}}{(s-j)x}\right)|\mathcal{H}| \\
&\le je^{7p}\left(\frac{1}{s}+\frac{1}{x}\right)|\mathcal{H}| \le je^{7p}\left(\frac{1}{y}+\frac{p}{y}\right)|\mathcal{H}| \le je^{7p}\cdot\frac{2p}{y}\cdot|\mathcal{H}| \\
&\le 4p^2e^{7p}\cdot\frac{|\mathcal{H}|}{y} = 4p^2e^{7p}\cdot\frac{|\mathcal{H}|}{e^{8p}} = 4p^2e^{-p}\cdot|\mathcal{H}|.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by $|\mathcal{B}'| = r' \le j \le 2p$,

$$|\mathcal{B}'|\cdot|\mathcal{H}(V)| \le 2p|\mathcal{H}(V)| \le 8p^3e^{-p}\cdot|\mathcal{H}| < \frac{1}{2}|\mathcal{H}|.$$

The lemma follows. □

Hence each $V \in \mathcal{H}$ intersects with at most $\frac{|\mathcal{H}|}{2|\mathcal{B}'|}$ sets in $\mathcal{H}$. There exist more than $|\mathcal{B}'|$ pairwise disjoint sets in $\mathcal{H}$. By definition, every element in $\mathcal{H}$ is disjoint with a set in $\mathcal{B} - \mathcal{B}'$. The cardinality $r$ of the coreless sunflower $\mathcal{B}$ in $\mathcal{F}$ is therefore not maximum. This contradiction proves Statement II, completing the proof of Theorem 1.2.

## Appendix: Proofs of Lemmas 2.1 and 2.2

**Lemma 2.1.** There exists a constant $c > 0$ such that $\Phi_2(s) \le \left(\frac{ck}{\ln\min(k,s)}\right)^s s!$ for any $s \ge 2$ and $k \ge 2$.

*Proof.* We first show the lemma when $s \le k$. By the definition of $\Phi_2(s)$ in Section 2,

$$\Phi_2(s) = \frac{1}{\ln 2 \cdot \ln 3 \cdots \ln s}\left(\frac{k}{\epsilon}\right)^s s!.$$

We assume $s \geq 3$ since the claim is trivially true for $s = 2$. It suffices to show $\frac{1}{\ln 2 \cdot \ln 3 \cdots \ln s} \left(\frac{k}{\epsilon}\right)^s s! \leq \left(\frac{e^2}{\ln s}\right)^s \left(\frac{k}{\epsilon}\right)^s s!$, or

$$\ln 2 \cdot \ln 3 \cdots \ln s \geq \left(\frac{\ln s}{e^2}\right)^s \tag{4.13}$$

$$\Leftrightarrow \quad \ln\ln 2 + \ln\ln 3 + \cdots + \ln\ln s \geq s \ln\ln s - 2s.$$

$\ln\ln x$ is a smooth, monotonically increasing function of $x \in \mathbb{R}^+$, so

$$\begin{aligned} & \ln\ln 3 + \ln\ln 4 + \cdots + \ln\ln s > \int_2^s \ln\ln x \; dx \\ = \quad & (s \ln\ln s - li(s)) - (2\ln\ln 2 - li(2)). \end{aligned}$$

Here $li(s)$ is the logarithmic integral $\int_0^s \frac{dx}{\ln x}$. As $\ln\ln 2 < 0$,

$$\ln\ln 2 + \ln\ln 3 + \cdots + \ln\ln s > s\ln\ln s - li(s) + li(2),$$

where $li(s) - li(2) = \int_2^s \frac{dx}{\ln x}$ is upper-bounded by $(s-2)/\ln 2 < 2s$. Hence, $\ln\ln 2 + \ln\ln 3 + \cdots + \ln\ln s \geq s\ln\ln s - 2s$, proving the lemma when $s \leq k$.

If $s > k$, the lemma is also proved by (4.13):

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_2(s) \quad &= \quad \frac{1}{\ln 2 \cdot \ln 3 \cdots \ln k \cdot (\ln k)^{s-k}} \left(\frac{k}{\epsilon}\right)^s s! \\ &\leq \quad \frac{1}{\left(\frac{\ln k}{e^2}\right)^k \cdot (\ln k)^{s-k}} \left(\frac{k}{\epsilon}\right)^s s! < \left(\frac{e^2 k}{\epsilon \ln k}\right)^s s!. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. □

**Lemma 2.2.** $\Phi_2(s) > \Phi_2(s-j) \exp\left(j \ln \frac{ks}{p_s} - \frac{j^2}{s} - 1\right)$ for a positive integer $j < s$.

*Proof.* It suffices to show $\left(\frac{k}{p_s}\right)^j \frac{s!}{(s-j)!} > \exp\left(j \ln \frac{ks}{p_s} - \frac{j^2}{s} - 1\right)$ due to (2.1), or

$$\frac{s!}{(s-j)!} > \exp\left(j \ln s - \frac{j^2}{s} - 1\right).$$

By (2.2), $\ln \frac{s!}{(s-j)!}$ is at least

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(s\ln s - s + \ln\sqrt{2\pi s}\right) - \left((s-j)\ln(s-j) - (s-j) + \ln\sqrt{s-j} + 1\right) \\ = \quad & s\ln s - (s-j)\ln(s-j) - j + \ln\frac{\sqrt{2\pi s}}{\sqrt{s-j}} - 1 \\ > \quad & s\ln s - (s-j)\left(\ln s + \ln\left(1 - \frac{j}{s}\right)\right) - j - 1 \\ = \quad & j\ln s - (s-j)\ln\left(1 - \frac{j}{s}\right) - j - 1. \end{aligned}$$

By the Taylor series of natural logarithm, $-\ln\left(1 - \frac{j}{s}\right) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{i}\left(\frac{j}{s}\right)^i > \frac{j}{s}$. From these,

$$\ln\frac{s!}{(s-k)!} > j\ln s + (s-j)\frac{j}{s} - j - 1 \geq j\ln s - \frac{j^2}{s} - 1,$$

which is equivalent to the desired inequality to prove the lemma. □

## References


1. N. Alon and R. B. Boppana, *The monotone circuit complexity of Boolean functions*, Combinatorica **7** (1987), 1–22.
2. N. Alon, A. Shpilka, and C. Umans, *On sunflowers and matrix multiplication*, Journal of Computational Complexity **22** (2013), 219–243.
3. D. Coppersmith and S. Winograd, *Matrix multiplication via arithmetic progression*, Journal of Symbolic Computation **9** (1990), 261–280.
4. P. Erdös, *On the combinatorial problem which i would most like to see solved*, Combinatorica **1** (1981), 25–42.
5. P. Erdös and R. Rado, *Intersection theorems for systems of sets*, Journal of the London Mathematical Society **35** (1960), 85–90.
6. Z. Füredi, *Turán type problems. surveys in combinatorics*, London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series **166** (1991), 253–300.
7. S. Jukna, *Extremal combinatorics with applications in computer science*, Springer, 2001.
8. A. V. Kostochka, *A bound of the cardinality of families not containing $\Delta$-systems*, The Mathematics of Paul Erdös, II (Algorithms and Combinatorics), Springer, 1997, pp. 229–235.
9. A.V. Kostochka, V. Rdl, and L.A. Talysheva, *On systems of small sets with no large $\Delta$-system*, Combinatorics, Probability and Computing **8** (1999), 265–268.
10. A. A. Razborov, *Lower bounds on the monotone complexity of some Boolean functions*, Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR (Russian) **281** (1985), 798–801.
11. H. Robbins, *A remark of stirling's formula*, Amer. Math. Monthly **62** (1955), 26–29.



Applied Research Laboratory, The Pennsylvania State University, PA 16802, USA
*E-mail address*: jxf140@psu.edu